

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview granted on September 15, 2009 during which the claims were discussed in light of the cited art.

Applicants hereby request a two-month extension of time.

The above amendments have been made to further clarify and define Applicants' invention and to expedite the present application to allowance.

Upon entry of the present amendment claims 48-50, 52, 59-61, and 63-68 will be pending, of which claims 48, 66, and 67 are independent.

The Examiner has objected to claims 58 and 61 for being duplicates of each other. Claim 58 is now canceled. Thus, the Examiner's objection is now moot.

The Examiner has rejected claim 62 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 62 is now canceled. Hence, the Examiner's rejection is now moot. Claim 63 has been amended to depend from Claim 48.

The Examiner has rejected claims 48, 52, 58-62, 99-102, 104, 106, 107, and 110-112 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,209,238 to Sundar. The Examiner has also rejected claims 48, 49, 52, 57-63, 66-68, 96, 99-107, and 110-113 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,163,716 to Edwards et al. in view of US Patent No. 5,797,903 to Swanson et al. To further clarify and set forth Applicants' invention, independent claims 48, 66, and 67 have been amended. More specifically, claims 48, 66, and 67 are now further clarified by including "a shared conductor". Neither Sundar, Edward, nor Swanson teach or suggest using a shared conductor. A closer look at both Sundar and Edwards makes it clear that both of these references specifically teach away from using a shared conductor between multiple effectors. Both Sundar and Edwards require using multiple conductors for multiple effectors.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 48, 66 and 67 as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of Examiner's rejections of independent claims 48, 66, and 67 and allowance of same is requested.

Claims 49, 50, 52, 59-61, amended claim 63, and 64-65 depend from and further limit independent claim 48. Thus, claims 49, 50, 52, 59-61, amended claim 63, and 64-65 are also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of claims 49, 50, 52, 59-61, and 63-65 and allowance of same is requested.

Claim 68 depends from and further limits independent claim 67. Thus, claim 68 is also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of claim 68 and allowance of same is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is now in good and proper form for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issuance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0815, order number PRTS-012.

Respectfully submitted,
BOZICEVIC, FIELD &
FRANCIS LLP

Date: October 1, 2009

By: /Pamela J. Sherwood, Reg. No. 36,677/
Pamela J. Sherwood, Ph.D.
Registration No. 36,677

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
1900 University Avenue, Suite 200
East Palo Alto, California 94303
Telephone: (650) 327-3400
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231